

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/771,047 Page 10

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****FEB 07 2007****REMARKS**

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5 - 8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Craig *et al.* ('574). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Leger *et al.* ('359). Claim 29 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Feldman ('098). Claims 2, 13 - 17 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig *et al.* ('574) in view of Stultz *et al.* ('756). Claims 30 and 41 - 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldman ('098) in view of Craig *et al.* ('574). Claims 3, 9 and 18 - 28 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in dependent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 29 - 45 and 47 - 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 31 - 45 and 47 - 51 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 52 - 56 were allowed.

In a response entitled Amendment C, Claims 1, 13, 29, and 46 were amended to include a limitation directed to a spatial filter. Likewise, the method claim (Claim 57) was amended to include a limitation directed to spatial filtering. These amendments were intended to bring the remaining claims into conformity with the apparent reasons for allowability with respect to Claim 52, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable.

Hence, Claims 1 - 3 and 5 - 9, 12 - 17, 19 - 29, 31 - 40 and 42 - 57 are presently pending.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/771,047 Page 11

However, the Examiner indicated by telephone in January of 2007 his intent to withdraw the previous indication of allowability. During a follow-up telephone conference with Applicants' Attorney, William Benman, the Examiner 1) clarified that his intent to withdraw his previous indication of allowable subject matter was based on Corcoran (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,581) and 2) indicated a willingness to allow Claim 9.

During the interview, the Examiner expressed the view that Corcoran taught the spatial filter invention of Claim 1 (see Amendment C). However, the Examiner indicated that the beam-flattening optics of Claim 9 appeared to be a significant and novel limitation. Hence, the Examiner indicated that the addition of the limitations of Claim 9 to Claim 1 and the addition of similar specific limitations the other independent claims as necessary would render the claims allowable.

Applicants' Attorney questioned the need to include the other limitations of Claim 9 in Claim 1. The Examiner indicated that the other elements might be required if, in the specification, a teaching is provided with respect to the possibility of using something other than beam flattening optics in an alternative embodiment. It is noted that no such teaching is provided in the Specification.


Accordingly, by this Paper, the suggestions set forth by the Examiner in the telephonic interview with Applicants' Attorney have been implemented in the Claims with the exception of the limitations of Claim 9 beyond the beam flattening optics thereof.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/771,047 Page 12

Hence, the present Claims should be allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
K. Spariosu *et al.*

By 
William J. Benman
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,014

Benman, Brown & Williams
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2740
Los Angeles, CA 90067

(310) 553-2400
(310) 553-2675 facsimile